

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 9, and 15 have been amended to clarify the relationship between the interpolator, burst clock and the processor. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph 25 of the published specification.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Oh (US 2001/0048723)

It is submitted that the Oh does not teach or suggest:

“a signal processor responsive to a burst clock”

or

“interpolator being further operative to enable a burst clock”

as recited by currently amended claim 1.

The present invention, as recited by claim 1, teaches a system wherein a processor is responsive to a burst clock and an interpolator is operative to enable the burst clock. This advantageously does not require every element of the synchronous mode design to respond to an enable signal to identify when processing is to proceed, since not every clock signal is accompanied by a digital symbol. (para. 5)

Oh does not teach or suggest a burst clock, let alone that the signal processor is responsive to said burst clock or that the interpolator enables the burst clock in response to a symbol being ready for processing. Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Oh. Such action is respectfully requested.

Maclean (US 2002/0110376) teaches a cubic interpolator, but does not teach or suggest a burst clock, a signal processor is responsive to said burst clock or that the

interpolator enables the burst clock in response to a symbol being ready for processing.
Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Maclean.

Furthermore since none of the cited references teach the limitations of claim 1 as referenced above, it is submitted that the present invention as recited by claim 1 is novel and non-obvious in light of any combination of the cited references. It is further submitted that currently amended independent claims 9 and 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-8, 10-14, and 16-20 are dependent from allowable independent claims 1, 9 and 15, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled. No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
AARON REEL BOUILLET ET AL.

By: /brian j cromarty/
Brian J Cromarty, Attorney
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

March 31, 2009